

after, the one probably from a pneumococcus, and the other from what may have been an influenza infection. While these secondary infections may have been contributory causes of death, it seems probable that the real cause was the syphilitic infection, and that anthropoids are profoundly affected by the disease will be evidenced as more experiments are made. Unfortunately the chimpanzee is a rather luxurious animal on which to experiment, for he is not only costly, but does not thrive in captivity.

THE UNITED RAILROADS OF SAN FRANCISCO.

In the *New York and Philadelphia Medical Journal* of February 6, 1904, is a news item which says that the New York Board of Health has undertaken to make a bacterioscopic study of paper money to discover if it probably may or may not be a medium for the dissemination of infectious diseases. Should it be shown that paper money habitually does contain disease germs, Dr. Thomas Darlington, Commissioner of the New York Board of Health, will "formulate a plan for the daily or weekly sterilization of money from the great arteries of trade, such as the street-car companies and the great retail stores."

In San Francisco, where paper money does not commonly circulate, the question is not such an important one, but there are three points to which the JOURNAL wishes to call the attention of the management of the United Railroads:

Ever since the introduction of the present transfer system, it is the custom for the conductors to wet their thumbs in their mouths to the more easily separate one or two transfers from the block, and not a few of the men will sometimes hold the block between their teeth so as to have two hands free for making change. Neither of these habits is cleanly. The amount of dirt the conductors put into their own mouths does not seem to occur to them, but the JOURNAL thinks for them and wishes them to be told what they are really doing. Moreover, the JOURNAL thinks for the people and protests against the public being obliged to use spat-on transfers, or have a series of annoying discussions with the conductors, for the JOURNAL has found out that conductors object to being asked for dry instead of wet transfers. The transfer itself is, of course, retired after having been used once, but a conductor with a streptococcus or diphtheritic infection latent in his throat could pass out potential amounts of infection to thousands of people every day, and some might easily infect their fingers and then their own mouths from the dirty transfers.

A second point is the way in which coins pass from hand to hand on the cars. Usually the passenger tenders his fare between a thumb and finger. The conductor takes it in the same way

and the fingers of passenger and conductor touch. This contact is not necessary and sometimes may be objectionable, as when a dirty-handed passenger offers money to the conductor, or when a dirty-handed conductor tenders change to the passenger. The correct way is for the passenger to put his fare into the conductor's hand, which should be held out, palm up, to receive it. No personal contact is needed in this transaction. The conductor should put the change into the passenger's upturned palm in the same way, without personal contact. This may be difficult to inaugurate, but a few placards in the cars, with illustrations, will help very much to educate the public, and the conductors can receive instructions from the company's office.

The third point is the hands of the conductors, or rather, the dirt that may be upon them. The JOURNAL knows perfectly well that the conductor must work bare-handed, and in a position most exposed to the acquiring of dirt, but it has noticed that some conductors always have clean hands, while others are very dirty-handed. This is no more true of conductors than it is of other men; but the fact that some men have clean hands and are conductors, shows that no one need have very dirty hands, and that hands as dirty as some conductors' hands are absolutely unnecessary. The JOURNAL suggests that the company arrange a place, at the end of each line, where conductors may wash their hands, and then make it obligatory that each man wash his hands at the up-town end of each trip.

COLORADO STATE SOCIETY JOURNAL.

Colorado Medicine, edited by Edward Jackson, is the form which the transactions of the Colorado State Medical Society has recently assumed. The monthly journal was authorized at the last meeting of the State Society and the first number appeared in November, 1903. The Colorado society is to be congratulated upon this move. No other single factor is so valuable or can be made to count with such force, as can the society journal properly edited and conducted. That the Colorado journal will be ably conducted under the guidance of Dr. Jackson, goes without saying. Every decent physician in the country should hug himself with a congratulatory embrace at the advent of another State Society journal, for through the medium of these journals will come eventual relief from the pest of nasty, murderous and shameless so-called "medical journals" which have existed too long. If ever a campaign of education and for decency was needed, it is needed now. The rank and file of the medical profession is a long way—a very long way—from the standards of honesty, ethics and decency of a generation or two ago. The average private "medical journal"

lives and fattens on the nostrum maker and the quack; and he, in turn, grows plethoric of dollars through the prostituting influence upon the innocent and ignorant in the medical profession, of these so-called "medical journals." To one who can see with his eyes and think with the brain which he is supposed to have, the whole thing is sickening, disgusting. Yet it will not do to simply keep hands off and let the merry game of swindle go on. It will not do for the decent journals — the journals that can and must be decent — the official mouthpieces of State Medical Societies — to simply keep the nasty stuff out of *their* advertising pages. Their duty is plainly writ and is something more; it should be an active warfare, and not merely a passive and negative doing of the right. It is difficult to express the keen pleasure with which we note the coming of another State Society journal; it means that the day of reckoning, the day when the filthy back-yard of materia medica will be cleaned up, is just so much nearer.

But why all this glee over the starting of a State Society journal? Because the State Society journal will reach and influence more men in its territory than all the other journals published in the world. If organization of the State Society is properly pushed, it ought to represent two-thirds

of the eligible physicians in the State, at the very least. The State journal is the property of every member of the organization; it is the official record of his county and his State Society meetings and transactions. If he does not take a more or less personal interest in it and its doings, then there is something wrong either with him or with the journal—probably with the journal. Now just see what that means. Take our own State, for example. Your JOURNAL reaches more doctors in this State than any possible combination of medical journals published the world over. And so it is in other States where there are State Society journals, and where there are not fights in the medical ranks. The possible influence of these journals, if properly exerted, is tremendous. And it *MUST* be exerted. It is bad enough for a private member of the profession to take this dirty money for these dirty, filthy nostrum advertisements and to make a living or gain notoriety through the pages of a "medical journal" whose every line is for sale and whose every word is a paid lie—but it would be infinitely worse for a journal published by a State Medical Society to do the same thing. State medical societies, for very shame, cannot pursue the policy of "dollars; to h—— with the ethics," as plainly put by one "medical editor," to the writer.

OUR APOLOGY.

In the October number, the JOURNAL took occasion to criticise one of the advertising methods of a very large manufacturing house; in fact, one of the largest chemical houses in the world. The advertisement in question was objectionable for two reasons. In the first place, it contained a glittering endorsement of a chemical recommended for use as a medicine (clearly and unquestionably a breach of both good taste and medical ethics), and in the second place the name of the physician endorsing this preparation, though located, in the advertisement, in San Francisco, does not occur in any register or directory of physicians, and the man has no license to practice medicine in this State. That much is fact; the balance may be a matter of opinion. Believing that the advertisement was rankly misleading, and an injustice to California physicians generally, the JOURNAL saw fit to request the house in question, through our columns, to correct the "error" and apologize for it. We did so for the principal reason that a house of such reputation and standing in the professional and commercial worlds should know enough to be above such peculiar practices. There is no use going after the little fellows, for they don't care; but the big ones ought to care, even if they do not. We wrote to several journals in which the advertisement in question is published, calling attention to the facts stated. One of these journals wrote to the house for an explanation, and in reply received a communication, a copy of which was sent to us. It enclosed a letter from Dr. Carl L. Schilling explaining the matter. We have learned, not directly, that this manufacturer feels hurt by our action, and thinks an apology due from us. The "hurtiness" is based upon two points: First, that there is a Dr. Schilling in

San Francisco, and, second, that the JOURNAL should have written to the house before publishing anything in its pages. In reply to the first contention let us quote from the advertisement and the more recent letter of Dr. Schilling, bearing in mind the fact that Dr. Schilling, while evidently a gentleman of great education and professional learning, is not a legal practitioner in San Francisco:

Advertisement.

"San Francisco, Cal. — I have been using _____ for over two years, and cannot say too much of it. I prescribe it wherever a general tonic is indicated, and with very good results."

Letter of Dr. Schilling.

"It is true that I have prescribed _____, as I have used it myself after an attack of malaria in Port Royal, S. C., and Savannah, Ga."

If the statement in the advertisement is true, and Dr. Schilling has been prescribing _____ "for over two years," the case comes within the provisions of the law, and should be looked into by the Board of Examiners. In his letter, Dr. Schilling states that he is not practicing medicine in California, and has not done so, and as he is evidently a gentleman of education and standing, we may be justified in accepting his own assurance in the matter. We are then confronted by the fact that a much misleading advertisement has been and still is being placed before the profession by this house—a house which claims that its well-known ethical character and high repute should protect it from such uncalled-for criticism. In reply to the second contention for an apology from us, we can only say that if the advertising manager of this house does not know any better than to make an "ethical" house do unethical things, he should be taught. This is the best "apology" we can make, under the circumstances.